

Plaintiff's Exhibit K

Defendants' Omnibus Responses and Objections to Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

KALOMA CARDWELL,

Plaintiff,

v.

DAVIS POLK & WARDWELL LLP,
THOMAS REID, JOHN BICK, WILLIAM
CHUDD, SOPHIA HUDSON, HAROLD
BIRNBAUM, DANIEL BRASS, BRIAN
WOLFE, and JOHN BUTLER,

Defendants.

19 Civ. 10256 (GHW)

**DEFENDANTS' OMNIBUS RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO
PLAINTIFF'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO DAVIS POLK, JOHN BICK,
HAROLD BIRNBAUM, DANIEL BRASS, JOHN BUTLER, WILLIAM CHUDD,
SOPHIA HUDSON, THOMAS REID, AND BRIAN WOLFE**

Pursuant to Rules 26 and 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules of the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, Defendants, Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP, John Bick, Harold Birnbaum, Daniel Brass, John Butler, William Chudd, Sophia Hudson, Thomas Reid, and Brian Wolfe (“Defendants”), submit the following omnibus responses and objections (the “Responses and Objections”) to Plaintiff’s interrogatories dated August 11, 2020 to Davis Polk, John Bick, Harold Birnbaum, Daniel Brass, John Butler, William Chudd, Sophia Hudson, Thomas Reid, and Brian Wolfe (the “Interrogatories”).

Pursuant to a September 10, 2020 agreement between the parties, Defendants were prepared—and remain prepared—to serve the Responses and Objections today, September 14, 2020, the date they are due. Defendants’ Responses and Objections, however, contain confidential information. Accordingly, among other objections, Defendants have objected to

serving the Responses and Objections unless and until there is an appropriate protective order in place.

Plaintiff and Defendants have so far been unable to agree on the terms of an appropriate protective order. In order not to delay the timely service of the Responses and Objections, Defendants offered to serve their Responses and Objections today, subject to the Court's model protective order, which would preserve Defendants' right to designate certain Responses as confidential, without prejudice to Plaintiff's rights to object to such designations. Plaintiff has refused to agree to this interim proposal or to agree to treat the Responses and Objections as confidential under the Court's model protective order until such time as this issue may be clarified by the Court.

Accordingly, Defendants object to the Interrogatories and to the service of the Responses and Objections until such time as the Court enters an appropriate protective order. Defendants reserve all other objections contained in the Responses and Objections until Defendants may serve such Responses and Objections pursuant to such a protective order, which Defendants are prepared to do immediately upon the Court's entry of such an order or Plaintiff's agreement to permit the service of the Responses and Objections subject to the Court's model protective order.

Dated: September 14, 2020

By: /s/ Bruce Birenboim

Bruce Birenboim (bbirenboim@paulweiss.com)

Jeh C. Johnson (jjohnson@paulweiss.com)

Susanna M. Buergel (sbuergel@paulweiss.com)

Marissa C.M. Doran (mdoran@paulweiss.com)

PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON &
GARRISON LLP

1285 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10019

(212) 373-3000

Attorneys for Defendants, Davis Polk & Wardwell
LLP, John Bick, Harold Birnbaum, Daniel Brass, John
Butler, William Chudd, Sophia Hudson, Thomas Reid,
and Brian Wolfe.